

ARGUMENTS

Rejection of Claims on Art Grounds in the 07 June 2007 Office Action, and
Traversal Thereof

In the June 7th, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-6 and 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pub. No. 2006/0190807 of Tran (hereinafter "Tran"). Also in that Office Action, claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran in view of US Pub. No. 2002/0161733 of Grainger (hereinafter "Grainger").

Claim Cancellations:

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled for reasons unrelated to the patentability of Applicant's invention. The respective rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Office Action, Item #5:

Claims 1-6 and 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tran. Applicant asserts that the claims have been amended to overcome the rejection. The discussion below explains Applicant's rationale.

First, with respect to claim 1, Applicant asserts that Tran nowhere teaches nor suggests a diagrammatic representation where *the graphical component structure includes the component content*. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 as amended provides for a graphical or visual hierarchal representation of a combination of graphical

component structure and textual component content, as shown in Figures 1 and 2, illustrated in Chart 1, and described in paragraphs 0021, 0026, 0027, 0033, 0038, 0041, 0047, 0070, and 0073 of the present application; this graphical or visual hierarchal presentation of the component structure and the component content is fundamentally different from the type of data communication utilized in Tran.

The Tran reference describes using two separate window layout frames, to display the claim structure and the claim content. In Tran, the textual claim content is placed in the left frame of a window, and an image of the claim structure is placed in the right frame of the window, as shown in Figure 3B of Tran. In Tran, the image of the claim structure and the claim content are displayed and function separately as required by Tran's teachings. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is directed to including the graphical component structure with the component content that is neither taught nor suggested in Tran.

Applicant also respectfully asserts that *Tran nowhere teaches a method of dynamic graphic rendering that provides interactive viewing of the graphical component structure and component content of all the components of an invention, including the key components and subcomponents in the resultant hierarchical diagram where the the graphical component structure and the included textual component content are part of the interactive viewing* as made possible by including graphical component structure with component content as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, Tran's separation of claim structure from content teaches away from and is substantively different from the present invention as claimed.

Further, *Tran fails to teach or suggest a way to compress or collapse the claim content hierarchically.* As only illustrated in Figure 3B of Tran, only two views are available to the user — the complete textual claim content and the graphical claim structure. These parts, the textual claim content and the graphical claim structure are kept *completely separate* in Tran. Additionally, there is *no connection between the claim structure and the associated claim text.* In Tran, as seen in Figure 3B, the claim text is in no way connected with the visualization of claim content; in fact, exemplary claims 1-5 and part of claim 6 is shown in the left window frame, but all the claim structure for claims 1-12 are shown in the right window frame. The *purpose of the Tran's claim structure is to facilitate textual reordering and renumbering* (see Tran, para. 0068). There is no visual connection showing the hierarchy of claim content and structure properly associated. Applicant's invention provides this connection which greatly facilitates the purposes of the invention. Therefore, there is no teaching, motivation, or suggestion in Tran, to combine it with another reference as compared to the present invention.

Claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1. Therefore, these claims are hereby traversed for the same grounds as stated with claim 1 above.

Claim 11 is similar to claim 1 except that it is directed to a method rather than a system. Claim 11 incorporates the same substantive amendments of claim 1. Claims 12-15 directly depend on claim 11. Therefore, claims 11-15 are hereby traversed for the same grounds as stated above with claim 1.

Claim 16 as amended is directed to a system for mapping technology using at least one computing device which includes at least one processing means for

automatically generating a diagrammatic representation of a technology; the diagrammatic representation is similar to that used in claim 1. As amended, claim 16 incorporates the substantive amendments made in claim 1. Therefore, claims 16 is hereby traversed for the same grounds as stated above with claim 1.

Claim 17 is similar to claim 16 except that it is directed to a method rather than a system. Claim 17 incorporates the same substantive amendments of claims 1 and 16. Therefore, Claim 17 is hereby traversed for the same grounds as stated above with claims 1 and 16.

Office Action, Item #7:

Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran in view of Grainger.

Applicant asserts that because independent claim 1 is now in allowable form, that claims 7-10, which are dependent on that claim, are also in allowable form. Claims 7-10 are hereby traversed for the same grounds as stated above for claim 1. Discussion of Grainger is unnecessary because the claims are patentable over Tran alone; however, Applicant's remarks in previous Papers for the present application regarding Grainger are still believed to be applicable.

Applicant asserts that the prior art references cited by the examiner do not anticipate the claims or render them unpatentable. Furthermore, claims have been amended in order to more distinctly claim the scope of the present invention. The above rejections of the claims 1-17 on the stated art grounds are traversed, and consideration of

Application No.: 09/943,799
Attorney Docket No. 4020-001

Reply to Office Action of June 7, 2007

the patentability of the currently pending claims 1-17, now amended, is requested, in light of the foregoing amendments and the above remarks.

Applicant notes that the present invention was found to be novel non-obvious and has been issued as a patent in several foreign countries.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, claims 1- 17, presently amended, constituting the claims pending in the application, are submitted to be fully patentable and in allowable condition to address and overcome the rejections. If any issues remain outstanding, incident to the allowance of the application, Examiner Ly is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (919) 268-4236 or via email at mark@trianglepatents.com to discuss the resolution of such issues, in order that prosecution of the application may be concluded favorably to the applicant, consistent with the applicant's making of a substantial advance in the art and particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

This response is submitted via facsimile to the USPTO Central Official Fax number 571.273.8300 on November 7, 2007, with a request for extension of time for two months, and payment of the fees therefore.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Lavender #54,254
Triangle Patents, PLLC
PO Box 28539
Raleigh, NC 27611-8539
919-268-4236
919-832-0303 (fax)